# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OPSEC SECURITY, INC.	
Plaintiff,	) )
vs.	) Case No
MOORE WALLACE NORTH AMERICA, INC., AND R.R. DONNELLEY & SONS COMPANY,	) Patent \$ 6,837,960 6,632,533 ) 5,370,763 6,764,57
Defendants.	5,364,994 7,204,909 5,704,652 5,595,624

# **COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff, OpSec Security, Inc., by its undersigned counsel, files its Complaint against Defendants, Moore Wallace North America, Inc., and R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company, as follows:

### NATURE OF THE ACTION AND SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

1. This is an action for patent infringement, arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et sec. and in particular arising under 35 U.S.C. § 271. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 281 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 because the actions asserted herein arise under the laws of the United States, 1338(a) because the actions asserted herein arise out of an Act of Congress relating to patents, and 1332 because there is complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and all Defendants and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs.

R.E.G 1-19 S, Temporary Operating Permit Stickers. OPSEC's bid was received on September 29, 2008.

- 26. On or about September 30, 2008, OPSEC was given notice via the California State Contracts Register that the Temporary Operating Permit Sticker Contract had been awarded to MWNA.
- 27. On October 3, 2008, a representative of OPSEC visited the California Department of Motor Vehicles Contract Office to view the MWNA bid proposal and to examine samples of the Temporary Operating Permit Stickers submitted by MWNA as part of its bid.
- 28. An inspection of the MWNA Temporary Operating Permit Sticker revealed that its construction infringes the OPSEC patents in several respects, including, but not limited to, the fact that the MWNA Temporary Operating Permit Sticker includes a full hologram over which is written variable information and which is then covered by what is believed to be a write-resistant covering.

# COUNT I PATENT INFRINGEMENT ('960 PATENT)

- 29. OPSEC realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 28 of this Complaint.
- 30. Defendants have infringed and are infringing, have induced and are inducing others to infringe and/or have contributed and are contributing to the infringement by others of the '960 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, importing or selling in the United States temporary motor vehicle tags that infringe the '960 Patent and Defendants will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

- 31. Defendants' infringement is willful and in deliberate disregard of OPSEC's rights under the '960 Patent.
- 32. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' acts and practices, OPSEC has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which OPSEC is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.
- 33. By reason of the acts and practices alleged herein, Defendants have caused, are causing, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause immediate and irreparable harm to OPSEC for which OPSEC has no adequate remedy at law and for which OPSEC is entitled to injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

# COUNT II PATENT INFRINGEMENT ('763 PATENT)

- 34. OPSEC realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 33 of this Complaint.
- 35. Defendants have infringed and are infringing, have induced and are inducing others to infringe and/or have contributed and are contributing to the infringement by others of the '763 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, importing or selling in the United States temporary motor vehicle tags that infringe the '763 Patent and Defendants will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

- 36. Defendants' infringement is willful and in deliberate disregard of OPSEC's rights under the '763 Patent.
- 37. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' acts and practices, OPSEC has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which OPSEC is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.
- 38. By reason of the acts and practices alleged herein, Defendants have caused, are causing, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause immediate and irreparable harm to OPSEC for which OPSEC has no adequate remedy at law and for which OPSEC is entitled to injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

# COUNT III PATENT INFRINGEMENT ('994 PATENT)

- 39. OPSEC realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 38 of this Complaint.
- 40. Defendants have infringed and are infringing, have induced and are inducing others to infringe and/or have contributed and are contributing to the infringement by others of the '994 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, importing or selling in the United States temporary motor vehicle tags that infringe the '994 Patent and Defendants will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

- 41. Defendants' infringement is willful and in deliberate disregard of OPSEC's rights under the '994 Patent.
- 42. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' acts and practices, OPSEC has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which OPSEC is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.
- 43. By reason of the acts and practices alleged herein, Defendants have caused, are causing, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause immediate and irreparable harm to OPSEC for which OPSEC has no adequate remedy at law and for which OPSEC is entitled to injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

# COUNT IV PATENT INFRINGEMENT '652 PATENT

- 44. OPSEC realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 43 of this Complaint.
- 45. Defendants have infringed and are infringing, have induced and are inducing others to infringe and/or have contributed and are contributing to the infringement by others of the '652 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, importing or selling in the United States temporary motor vehicle tags that infringe the '652 Patent and Defendants will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

- 46. Defendants' infringement is willful and in deliberate disregard of OPSEC's rights under the '652 Patent.
- 47. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' acts and practices, OPSEC has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which OPSEC is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.
- 48. By reason of the acts and practices alleged herein, Defendants have caused, are causing, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause immediate and irreparable harm to OPSEC for which OPSEC has no adequate remedy at law and for which OPSEC is entitled to injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

# COUNT V PATENT INFRINGEMENT '624 PATENT

- 49. OPSEC realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 48 of this Complaint.
- 50. Defendants have infringed and are infringing, have induced and are inducing others to infringe and/or have contributed and are contributing to the infringement by others of the '624 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, importing or selling in the United States temporary motor vehicle tags that infringe the '624 Patent and Defendants will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

- 51. Defendants' infringement is willful and in deliberate disregard of OPSEC's rights under the '624 Patent.
- 52. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' acts and practices, OPSEC has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which OPSEC is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.
- 53. By reason of the acts and practices alleged herein, Defendants have caused, are causing, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause immediate and irreparable harm to OPSEC for which OPSEC has no adequate remedy at law and for which OPSEC is entitled to injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

# COUNT VI PATENT INFRINGEMENT '533 PATENT

- 54. OPSEC realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 53 of this Complaint.
- 55. Defendants have infringed and are infringing, have induced and are inducing others to infringe and/or have contributed and are contributing to the infringement by others of the '533 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, importing or selling in the United States temporary motor vehicle tags that infringe the '533 Patent and Defendants will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

- 56. Defendants' infringement is willful and in deliberate disregard of OPSEC's rights under the '533 Patent.
- 57. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' acts and practices, OPSEC has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which OPSEC is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.
- 58. By reason of the acts and practices alleged herein, Defendants have caused, are causing, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause immediate and irreparable harm to OPSEC for which OPSEC has no adequate remedy at law and for which OPSEC is entitled to injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

# COUNT VII PATENT INFRINGEMENT '571 PATENT

- 59. OPSEC realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 58 of this Complaint.
- 60. Defendants have infringed and are infringing, have induced and are inducing others to infringe and/or have contributed and are contributing to the infringement by others of the '571 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, importing or selling in the United States temporary motor vehicle tags that infringe the '571 Patent and Defendants will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

{J1229966.1}

- 61. Defendants' infringement is willful and in deliberate disregard of OPSEC's rights under the '571 Patent.
- 62. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' acts and practices, OPSEC has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which OPSEC is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.
- 63. By reason of the acts and practices alleged herein, Defendants have caused, are causing, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause immediate and irreparable harm to OPSEC for which OPSEC has no adequate remedy at law and for which OPSEC is entitled to injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

# COUNT VIII PATENT INFRINGEMENT '909 PATENT

- 64. OPSEC realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 63 of this Complaint.
- 65. Defendants have infringed and are infringing, have induced and are inducing others to infringe and/or have contributed and are contributing to the infringement by others of the '909 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, importing or selling in the United States temporary motor vehicle tags that infringe the '909 Patent and Defendants will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

{J1229966.1}

- 66. Defendants' infringement is willful and in deliberate disregard of OPSEC's rights under the '909 Patent.
- 67. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' acts and practices, OPSEC has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which OPSEC is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.
- 68. By reason of the acts and practices alleged herein, Defendants have caused, are causing, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause immediate and irreparable harm to OPSEC for which OPSEC has no adequate remedy at law and for which OPSEC is entitled to injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

# **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, OPSEC prays for relief against the Defendants as follows:

- A. For judgment declaring that Defendants have infringed, induced the infringement of, or contributorily infringed United States Patent No.'s 6,837,960; 5,370,763; 6,364,994; 5,704,652; 5,595,624; 6,632,533; 6,764,571; and 7,204,909 and that such infringements have been willful;
- B. For a temporary restraining order and preliminary and permanent injunction requiring Defendants to recall all of the infringing temporary vehicle tags, and enjoining Defendants, their officers,

agents, servants, representatives, employees, attorneys, privies, successors and assigns, and all persons and entities holding by, through, or under them, and all those acting for or on their behalf, or acting in concert with them, from directly or indirectly making or causing to be made, importing, causing to be imported, using, or causing to be used, offered for sale, or causing to be offered for sale, or selling, or causing to be sold the infringing temporary vehicle tags, or any other product which infringes any of OPSEC's United States patents and from any further infringement, contributory infringement or inducement of infringement, of any of OPSEC's United States patents as authorized by 35 U.S.C. § 283;

# C. For monetary relief as follows:

- 1. A judgment requiring the Defendants to pay OPSEC damages adequate to compensate for the infringements, but in no event less than a reasonable loyalty for the use made of OPSEC's inventions by the Defendants, together with interest and costs as fixed by the Court, caused by reason of the Defendants' infringement, inducement of infringement, or contributory infringement of any of OPSEC's United States patents as authorized by 35 U.S.C. § 284; and
- A judgment awarding OPSEC increased damages in view of the Defendants' intentional, willful and wanton violation of OPSEC's Patents, as well as prejudgment interest, plus

#### **PARTIES**

- 2. OpSec Security, Inc. ("OPSEC") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Colorado with its principal place of business located at 535 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 920, Denver, Colorado 80202. OPSEC is the owner of numerous patents related to motor vehicle temporary tag technology.
- 3. Moore Wallace North America, Inc. ("MWNA") is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business located at 1200 Lakeside Drive, Bannockburn, Illinois 60015. MWNA is wholly owned and controlled by R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company and is engaged in numerous business activities including, but not limited to, the making, offering for sale, selling and use of the inventions relating to temporary motor vehicle tags as set forth in one or more of the claims of certain United States patents owned by OPSEC as described more fully hereinbelow.
- 4. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company ("RRD") is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business located at 111 South Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606. RRD is a multi-national corporation which transacts business in numerous states within the United States, including the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 5. MWNA and RRD are hereinafter sometimes collectively referred to as "the Defendants." The Defendants have acted in concern in the conduct which constitutes the acts of infringement set forth hereinbelow.

OPSEC's costs, expenses and attorneys' fees in this action as authorized by 35 U.S.C. §§ 284 and 285.

D. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark A. Willard
Mark A. Willard, Esq.
Pa. I.D. No. 18103
David V. Radack, Esq.
Pa. I.D. No. 39633
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott
Firm No. 075
U.S. Steel Tower, 44<sup>th</sup> Floor
600 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219.2788
(412) 566.6000
Attorneys for Plaintiff, OpSec Security, Inc.

Dated: October 7, 2008.

{J1229966.1}

# Case 2:08-mc-02025-CBDodDoremt4:092-2

Filed 10/07//2008

Page 1 of 3

OJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

# **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. ISEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM J

(County of Residence of First Listed Defendancy Parts Annahrs Cottons Name In Land Companies of First Listed Defendancy Parts Annahrs Cottons Name In Land Companies of First Listed Defendancy Parts Annahrs Cottons Name In Land Companies of First Listed Defendancy Parts Annahrs Cottons Name In Land Companies of First Listed Defendancy Parts Annahrs Cottons Name In Land Companies of First Listed Defendancy Notice In Land Companies In Land	(a) PLAINTIFFS OPSEC SECURITY, INC. DEFENDANTS MOORE WALLACE NORTH AMERICA, INC.,					C., ET 41					
Ecker C, Seamune, Cherin & Mellott, 600 Ginnt Street, 44th Fiz. Pgb, PA (412) 566-6171  II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION  III. BASIS OF JURISDICTION  III. CHERNIE C PRINCIPAL PARTIES  Office an "X" in One bits Only)  III. CHERNIE C PRINCIPAL PARTIES  Office an "X" in One bits Only)  III. CHERNIE C PRINCIPAL PARTIES  Office an "X" in One bits Only)  Office of "X" in One bits Only)  III. CHERNIE C PRINCIPAL PARTIES  Office an "X" in One bits Only)  Office of "X" in One bits of Intended Inte					(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)						
## Attorneys inflowed	(c) Attorneys Mark A. W	illard, Esq. and David V. Rac	łack, Esq.		Attorneys Mark	A. Will	ard, Esq. a	and Audrey K. K	wak, Esq.,	*********	
B. BASIS OF JURISDICTION   Tritica in "X" in One Boar Chap)   III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES   Information and done see for believable and the see for believable	Eckert, Seamans, Cherin &	Mellott, 600 Grant Street, 44t	th Flr., Pgh, PA (412) 56	56-6171				·,			
Part   U.S. Government   Res a Penny   Clister of This State   This	(Firm Nam	e, Address, and Telephone N	umber)		Attorneys (If Know	vn)					
Plantiff		Wilder St. Williams	e Box Only)	III. CITI	(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)						
Part   Defendance   Defendanc	₹, i*	4-13	or a Damui	Cirlan	on of this Crass			1	sia siant Otoca	PTF DEF	
Contribution   Cont	3 943110111	(O.2. GOVERNINGIN THE	A O Tally)	Ciuzi	th Ot 1105 21446	1 32		•	-	□4	□4
Citizen or Subject of a Contrology   The Centre of Control of Co	E.u	t	of Dartins in Jean III	Citize	en of Another State	<u> </u>	<b>□</b> ²	•		<b>5</b>	<u>[</u> 5
CONTRACT    100 Instruction   101 Instruction   102 Appeal 28 USC 158   103 Appeal 28 USC 158   104 USC 158   105 USC 158		more charant	(प) र वाराइड ॥( Itgi <i>te tay</i>		-	<b>∏</b> 3	<b>[</b> ]3	Foreign Nation		□e	<b>□</b> 6
Distriction   Passed   Passe		(Place an "X" in One Box Only)									
30 M arine   33 to Airplane   34 Airplane   34 to Airplane   35 to Airplane   36 Personal Plany   36 Personal Plany   36 M arine   36 M arine   37 to Airplane   37 to Airplane   38 to Airplan		<del> </del>		FORF	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
V. ORIGIN    Original   Proceeding   Proceeding   State Court   State Court   State Court   Appellate	120 M arine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment Extiliarcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders Suits 190 Other Contract 190 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Tors to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	310 Airphane 315 Airphane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers Liability 340 M arine 345 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 M otor Vehicle 355 M otor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVI. RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	362 Personal Injury Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Trush in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS \$10 Motions to Vacas Sentence Habeas Corpus: \$330 General \$335 Death Penalty \$40 Mandamus & Oth		620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Scieure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Lams 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupationel Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relation 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act MMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Applicati 463 Habcas Corpus-Alten 463 Habcas Corpus-Alten 464 Habcas Corpus-Alten 465 Habcas Corpus-Alten 465 Habcas Corpus-Alten 466 Habcas Corpus-Alten	s don	423 Within 28 USC PROPERTY  820 Cop 830 Pmer  \$30 Trad  \$61 H1A 862 Black 863 DIW 7 865 RSI 7 865 RSI 7 7 7 7 8 8 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	drawal 1157 RIGHTS byrights nt lemark CORTY (1395ff) k Lung (923) v COTWW (405(g)) O Title XVI (405(g)) AX SUITS ex (U S. Plainjiff endant) -Third Party	410 Antirt 430 Bunk: 450 Comr 460 Depo 470 Rack Corrup 880 Cons 490 Cable 810 Seice 850 Secur 871 Cust 390 Other 891 Agric 892 Econ 893 Freet Act 900Appes Under	asti and Bankin merce visition of Pankin in the Corporation of Information of Fee Dei Equal Access	ge  dities/  ge  ctions  tation Act  lauers  b Act  mation  ermination
Cause of Action   Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):   35 U.S.C. 271		446 Amer. n/Disabilities - Other	٠ اسا ١		465 Other Immigration				1 1 1		of
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:  CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION  UNDER F.R.C.P. 23  DEMAND \$ Excess of \$75,000.00  JURY DEMAND:  Yes NO  VIII. RELATED CASE(S)  IF ANY  DOCKET NUMBER  DOCKET NUMBER  SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /S/ Mark A. Willard	Original	Removed from	Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Red	istated or 📑 s ar	nother	district	6 Litigatio	trict n [7	Judge fr Magistra	rom ate
COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23  DEMAND \$ EXCESS 01 575,000.00  JURY DEMAND: Yes X No  VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY  DOCKET NUMBER  DOCKET NUMBER  DATE 10/07/08  SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /S/ Mark A. Willard	VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	i	-	• .	ot cite jurisdictional	statut	es uniess	diversity): 35 U	J.5.C. 271		
IF ANY    See Instructions): JUDGE   DOCKET NUMBER				DE	MAND § Excess of \$	75,000		•			
		E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE				DOCKET	NUMBER			,
FUR OFFICE OSE ONLY		-	SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	NEY OF RE	CORD /s/ Mark A. Wil	lard					
RECEIPT# AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE		AMOUNT	APPLYING IFP	_	JUDO	Œ		MAG. J	UDGE		

#### JS 44AREVISED OCTOBER, 1993

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### THIS CASE DESIGNATION SHEET MUST BE COMPLETED

PART A			
		s on the Erie Johnstown X Pittsburgh) calendar.  DAR-If cause of action arose in the counties of Crawford, Elk, Erie, Forest, McKean. Venang	
4	or Wan	ren, OR any plaintiff or defendant resides in one of said counties.	
		I CALENDAR - If cause of action arose in the counties of Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Clearfield plaintiff or defendant resides in one of said counties.	or
3. Comple	ete if on	ERIE CALENDAR: I certify that the cause of action arose in	County and
	that th	resides in	County.
4. Compl	ete if on	JOHNSTOWN CALENDAR: I certify that the cause of action arose in	County
and th	at the	resides in	County.
PART	В (Уо	ou are to check ONE of the following)	
1.	This c	ase is related to Number Judge	
2. X		ase is not related to a pending or terminated case.  OF RELATED CASES:	
same iss	sues of	ases are deemed related when a case filed relates to property included in another suit or involve fact or it grows out of the same transactions as another suit or involves the validity or infringe yed in another suit	
-		ved in anomer suit IAIN: Cases in contiguous closely located groups and in common ownership groups which i	ed)
		es to consolidation for trial shall be deemed related.	
		US & CIVIL RIGHTS: All habeas corpus petitions filed by the same individual shall be dee	med
PARTC	Ali pro	se Civil Rights actions by the same individual shall be deemed related.	
1. CIVIL	CATE	GORY (Place x in only applicable category).	
1	П	Antitrust and Securities Act Cases	
2.		Labor-Management Relations	
.3,	П	Habeas Corpus	
4.	П	Civil Rights	
5.	X	Patent, Copyright, and Trademark	
6.	n	Eminent Domain	
7.	n	All other federal question cases	
8.	П	All personal and property damage tort cases, including maritime, FELA, Jones Act, Moto vehicle, products liability, assault, defamation, malicious prosecution, and false arrest	or
9.	$\Box$	Insurance indemnity, contract and other diversity cases.	
10.		Government Collection Cases (shall include HEW Student Loans (Education VA Overpayment, Overpayment of Social Security, Enlistment Overpayment (Army, Navy, e HUD Loans, GAO Loans (Misc. Types), Mortgage Foreclosures, <b>S.BA.</b> Loans, <b>Civil</b> Penalties and Coal Mine Penalty and Reclamation Fees.)	tc.),
i cer	tify tha	at to the best of my knowledge the entries on this Case Designation Sheet are true and correct	
DATE	10/07/0	8 ATTORNEY ATTORNEY AT LAW /s/ Mark A. Willard	
NOTE:	ALL	SECTIONS OF BOTH SIDES MUST BE COMPLETED BEFORE CASE CAN BE	

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 11/04)

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

#### **Authority For Civil Cover Sheet**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a agency, goseomby within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see
- attachment)"
  Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings.
  Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
  United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over civersity cases.)

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated Mark this Section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section below, Misufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts, Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's

decision.

YI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless

Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553

diversity.

Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable

VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded. **VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

#### PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. Defendants are subject to the personal jurisdiction of this Court pursuant to 42 Pa.C.S. § 5322, because Defendants conduct business activities which constitute transacting business within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in accordance with 42 Pa.C.S. § 5321(a) and are subject to the jurisdiction of this Court to the fullest extent allowed under the Constitution of the United States in accordance with 42 Pa.C.S. § 5322(b).
- 7. Venue over this action is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(a), 1391(b), and 1400(b), because this Judicial District is a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims asserted herein occurred, because Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction within this Judicial District and therefore, reside within this Judicial District and, because Defendants conduct a systematic and regular business activity within this Judicial District.

#### FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

## THE OPSEC PATENTS

#### PATENT NO. 6,837,960

8. On January 4, 2005, United States Patent No. 6,837,960 ("the '960 Patent") was duly and validly issued to Yoram Curiel for an invention relating to, *inter alia*, a tamper evident informational article such as a temporary vehicle registration which may be made of paper or paperboard wherein the informational article has a zone for inserting information in a pattern within said zone which will resist effective counterfeiting and a transparent tape which preferably has a silicone resin coating which contains a wax and is adhesively secured over the information contained within

the zone. A true and correct copy of the '960 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit "A" and is incorporated herein by reference.

9. Through a series of assignments from Yoram Curiel to others and ultimately to OPSEC as shown in the "Patent Bibliographic Data" and "Patent Assignment Abstract of Title" attached hereto as Exhibit "B", OPSEC is the cwner of the '960 Patent, the '960 Patent is currently subsisting and OPSEC is the real party in interest with the right to seek the relief requested in this Complaint.

#### **PATENT NO. 5,370,763**

- 10. On December 6, 1994, United States Patent No. 5,370,763 ("the '763 Patent") was duly and validly issued to Yoram Curiel for an invention relating to, *inter alia*, a tamper evident informational article such as a temporary vehicle registration which may be made of paper or paperboard, which informational article has a zone for inserting information and a pattern within said zone which will resist effective counterfeiting and a transparent tape which preferably has a silicone resin coating which contains a wax adhesively secured over the information contained within the zone. A true and correct copy of the '763 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit "C" and is incorporated herein by reference.
- 11. Through a series of assignments from Yoram Curiel to others and ultimately to OPSEC as shown in the "Patent Bibliographic Data" and "Patent Assignment Abstract of Title" attached hereto as Exhibit "D", OPSEC is the owner of the '763 Patent, the '763 Patent is currently subsisting and OPSEC is the real party in interest with the right to seek the relief requested in this Complaint.

#### PATENT NO. 6,364,994

- 12. On April 2, 2002, United States Patent No. 6,364,994 ("the '994 Patent") was duly and validly issued to Yoram Curiel for an invention relating to, *inter alia*, a method of protecting an informational article, including providing an informational article substrate, having a zone for inserting variable information and a refractive image disposed within the zone, inserting the information in the zone so that at least a portion of the information is over the image, and securing a transparent tape having a write-resistant exposed surface over the information. A true and correct copy of the '994 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit "E" and is incorporated herein by reference.
- 13. Through a series of assignments from Yoram Curiel to others and ultimately to OPSEC as shown in the "Patent Bibliographic Data" and "Patent Assignment Abstract of Title" attached hereto as Exhibit "F", OPSEC is the owner of the '994 Patent, the '994 Patent is currently subsisting and OPSEC is the real party in interest with the right to seek the relief requested in this Complaint.

#### PATENT NO. 5,704,652

14. On January 6, 1998, United States Patent No. 5,704,652 ("the '652 Patent") was duly and validly issued to Yoram Curiel for an invention relating to, *inter alia*, a tamper evident informational article such as a temporary vehicle registration which may be made of paper or paperboard which has a zone for inserting information and a pattern within said zone which will resist effective counterfeiting and a transparent tape which preferable has a silicone resin coating which contains wax adhesively secured over the information contained within the zone. A true and correct copy of the

'652 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit "G" and is incorporated herein by reference.

15. Through a series of assignments from Yoram Curiel to others and ultimately to OPSEC as shown in the "Patent Bibliographic Data" and "Patent Assignment Abstract of Title" attached hereto as Exhibit "H", OPSEC is the owner of the '652 Patent, the '652 Patent is currently subsisting and OPSEC is the real party in interest with the right to seek the relief requested in this Complaint.

#### PATENT NO. 5,595,624

- Patent") was duly and validly issued to Yoram Curiel for an invention relating to, inter alia, a method of protecting an informational article on which variable information is inserted, from photocopy duplication and alternation which method compromises providing an informational article substrate, having a zone for inserting the variable information and a refractive image disposed within the zone wherein variable information is inserted in the zone and transparent tape is secured over the variable information, which transparent tape has a write-resistant exposed surface, such that the refractive image will resist photocopy duplication or the variable information article and the write-resistant exposed surface will resist alteration of the inserted variable information. A true and correct copy of the '624 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit "I" and is incorporated herein by reference.
- 17. Through a series of assignments from Yoram Curiel to others and ultimately to OPSEC as shown in the "Patent Bibliographic Data" and "Patent Assignment Abstract of Title" attached hereto as Exhibit "J", OPSEC is the owner of the

'624 Patent, the '624 Patent is currently subsisting and OPSEC is the real party in interest with the right to seek the relief requested in this Complaint.

#### **PATENT NO. 6,632,533**

- 18. On or about October 14, 2003, United States Patent No. 6,632,533 ("the '533 Patent") was duly and validly issued to Yoram Curiel for an invention relating to, inter alia, a tamper evident informational article, such as a temporary vehicle registration which may be made of paper or paperboard which informational article has a zone for inserting information and a pattern within said zone which will resist effective counterfeiting and a transparent tape which preferably has a silicone resin coating which contains a wax adhesively secured over the information contained within the zone. A true and correct copy of the '533 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit "K" and is incorporated herein by reference.
- 19. Through a series of assignments from Yoram Curiel to others and ultimately to OPSEC as shown in the "Patent Bibliographic Data" and "Patent Assignment Abstract of Title" attached hereto as Exhibit "L", OPSEC is the owner of the '533 Patent, the '533 Patent is currently subsisting and OPSEC is the real party in interest with the right to seek the relief requested in this Complaint.

#### PATENT NO. 6,764,571

20. On July 20, 2004, United States Patent No. 6,7694,571 ("the '571 Patent") was duly and validly issued to Yoram Curiel for an invention relating to, *inter alia*, a tamper evident information article, such as a temporary vehicle registration which may be made of paper or paperboard which information article includes a substrate, having a

zone for inserting information and a refractive image disposed within the zone and a covering secured to at least a portion of the zone in such a way that efforts to remove the covering from the substrate will result in removal of a portion of the refractive image. A true and correct copy of the '571 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit "M" and is incorporated herein by this reference.

21. Through a series of assignments from Yoram Curiel to others and ultimately to OPSEC as shown in the "Patent Bibliographic Data" and "Patent Assignment Abstract of Title" attached hereto as Exhibit "N", OPSEC is the owner of the '571 Patent, the '571 Patent is currently subsisting and OPSEC is the real party in interest with the right to seek the relief requested in this Complaint.

#### **PATENT NO. 7,204,909**

- 22. On April 17, 2007, United States Patent NO. 7,204,909 ("the '909 Patent") was duly and validly issued to Yoram Curiel and Mark Timothy Turnage for an invention relating to, inter alia, an informational article on which variable information is inserted, which informational article includes a substrate having a zone for inserting the variable information and a visual security device, such as an optically variable ink, a special film, or combination thereof disposed in the zone on the substrate with the visual security device sized and arranged such that at least a portion of the variable information is adapted to being inserted over the visual security device. A true and correct copy of the '909 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit "O" and is incorporated herein by this reference.
- 23. Through a series of assignments from Yoram Curiel and Mark Timothy
  Turnage to OPSEC as shown in the "Patent Assignment Abstract of Title" attached

hereto as Exhibit "P", OPSEC is the owner of the '909 Patent, the '909 Patent is currently subsisting and OPSEC is the real party in interest with the right to seek the relief requested in this Complaint.

- 24. As the owner of the foregoing United States patents that relate to temporary vehicle tags (the "OPSEC Patents"), OPSEC makes and sells temporary motor vehicle tags to numerous state motor vehicle departments throughout the United States including the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Although there are certain minor variations in the temporary vehicle tags sold from state to state, in general, such temporary vehicle tags include a substrate made typically of paper or cardboard, having a zone for inserting variable information, typically an expiration date in the form of mm/dd/yyyy. The zone has disposed therein a refractive image, such as a strip or holographic tape. The expiration date of the temporary motor vehicle tag is written overtop of the refractive strip. After the expiration date is written, the refractive strip can then be, optionally, covered by a transparent tape, which preferably has a "write-resist" The refractive strip and the write-resist surface of the transparent tape combined resists both photocopy duplication of the temporary vehicle tag and alteration of the inserted expiration date. This temporary motor vehicle tag product, which has been sold by OPSEC for over ten (10) years, has been a major success in the market, as evidenced by the fact that numerous state motor vehicle departments have adopted OPSEC's patented technology for use as their temporary motor vehicle tags.
- 25. On or about September 26, 2008, OPSEC submitted a bid to the California Department of Motor Vehicles to sell and supply Temporary Operating Permit Stickers to the California Department of Motor Vehicles under Contract N. 08-146 for